

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. Claims 1-2 and 7-8 are amended and claims 3 and 6 are cancelled. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is amended to include a combination of the features present in original claims 3 and 6.

I. Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the Abstract, line 8, and the paragraph starting at page 6, line 3, for including language that is confusing.

By this amendment, the phrase "where projected from" within the Abstract, at line 8, has been changed to "where the shielding member is projected from." Further, reference to "armored bodies 30" within the paragraph starting at page 6, line 3, has been changed to "outer covering 30." Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

II. Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 2 and 8 and identifies specific informalities associated with each.

Applicant respectfully submits that the informalities identified by the Office Action are addressed by the amended claims. Specifically, the phrase "where projected from" in claim 1 has been replaced with "where the shielding member is projected from." The phrase "in tube shape" in claims 1 and 2 has been replaced with "in a tube shape." The phrase "the opening" in claim 2 has been replaced with "an opening." Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

III. §102 Rejection

Claims 1-5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Japanese Patent JP02002324627A to Fukushima et al. ("Fukushima"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to include features recited in original claims 3 and 6. Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the shielded wire harness further comprises a covering member formed in a tube shape and configured to cover the diameter-spread portion, . . . wherein the covering member is made of elastic material." As admitted in the Office Action on page 4, paragraph 7, Fukushima does not disclose, teach or suggest such a feature.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Fukushima. Claims 2-5 and 9 depend from independent claim 1 and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Fukushima for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. §103 Rejection of Claims 6 and 7

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fukushima in view of U.S. Patent 5,304,067 to Inaba et al. (Inaba). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a covering member made of elastic material "in order to provide interconnection between housings and cables" as taught by Inaba.

However, Applicant respectfully notes that an interconnection between housings and cables in Fukushima is already established "by an electrically conductive metallic band-like

clamp 26" with an optional use of "spot-welding" as described at col. 5, lines 18-33.

Because the housings and cables are already thus connected, the Office Action's suggested motivation of "providing interconnection" is without merit.

As described at col. 5, lines 34-49, funnel like protector 27 holds clamp 26 from the outside and is bolted to a structure via a flange portion 27c. Further, as stated in Fukushima at col. 5, lines 37-39, the "narrowed end portion 27a of protector 27 is sandwich-held between the terminal portion of the corrugated tube 15 and the braid 14." Applicant respectfully asserts that such an approach would not benefit from the use of an elastic material. Given that one end of protector 27 is bolted and the other end of protector 27 is sandwiched, there is no need for, or benefit from, protector 27 being an elastic material, as described in Inaba.

In Inaba, rear covers 27 and 28 include projecting strips that grip a cable to form a connection (See Inaba, col. 3, lines 6-14). In such a design, use of an elastic material is beneficial so that the projecting strips can grip a cable. However, as described above, Fukushima does not make use of an interconnection between housings and cables that would benefit from use of an elastic material as described in Inaba.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there would have been no motivation to use a covering member made of elastic material based upon Fukushima in view of Inaba as asserted by the Office Action. The connection between housings and cables as taught by Fukushima would not benefit from the use of an elastic material as taught by Inaba.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the alleged motivation to combine Fukushima and Inaba would not have existed, and that therefore the combination is improper. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

V. §103 Rejection of Claim 8

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fukushima in view of U.S. Patent 6,609,934 to Chen et al. (Chen). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the shielded wire harness further comprises a covering member formed in a tube shape and configured to cover the diameter-spread portion, . . . wherein the covering member is made of elastic material." Applicant respectfully submits, as discussed above, that Fukushima does not disclose, teach or suggest such a feature and that such a feature would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made. Nothing in Chen corrects this deficiency. Therefore, the combination of Fukushima and Chen cannot be held to anticipate the present invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the cited combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JMH/jan

Attachment:

Substitute Abstract
Petition for One-Month Extension of Time

Date: January 10, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--